

***California
Commission on Teacher Credentialing***

***Meeting of
February 6-7, 2002***

AGENDA ITEM NUMBER: **PREP – 2**

COMMITTEE: **Preparation Standards Committee**

TITLE: **Update on the Comparability Studies of Subject Matter
Requirements in Other States (AB 877 – Scott, 2000)**

 X **Action**

 Information

 Report

Strategic Plan Goal(s):

Goal 1: **Promote educational excellence through the preparation and certification of professional educators**

- Sustain high quality standards for the preparation of professional educators

Goal 6: **Provide leadership in exploring multiple, high quality routes to prepare professional educators for California schools**

- Work with education entities to expand the pool of qualified professional educators

Prepared By: _____ **Date:** _____

**Phil Fitch, Ed.D.
Consultant, Professional Services Division**

Approved By: _____ **Date:** _____

**Margaret Olebe, Ph.D.
Administrator, Professional Services Division**

Approved By: _____ **Date:** _____

**Mary Vixie Sandy
Director, Professional Services Division**

Authorized By: _____ **Date:** _____

**Sam W. Swofford Ed.D.
Executive Director**

**Update on the Comparability Studies of Subject Matter
Requirements in Other States
(AB 877 – Scott, 2000)**

Professional Services Division

December 27, 2001

Executive Summary

This is the third agenda item that has been prepared for Commission consideration that relates to the comparability of both multiple subject and single subject, subject matter requirements in other states with those of California. The first agenda item related to the comparability of the multiple subject, subject matter requirements of ten selected states. The Commission voted on September 6, 2001 that nine of the ten states studied were comparable to the Commission approved multiple subject, subject matter requirements. The second agenda item was considered by the Commission at its October 4, 2001 meeting. This item provided comparability data on nineteen additional states for multiple subject, subject matter requirements and the requirements for Washington D.C. The Commission voted on October 4 that eleven of the twenty states studied were comparable to the requirements in California. The second agenda item also included comparability data that was approved by the Commission on October 4, 2001 for single subject, subject matter requirements in several fields. If the Commission acts favorably on the staff recommendations and findings of comparability presented in this item, there will be 36 states that been found to have comparable multiple subject, subject matter requirements. Also, there will be a large number of states found to have comparable single subject, subject matter requirements in various single subject fields

The comparability studies of subject matter requirements of the states were authorized by Commission sponsored legislation) and have been completed through contracted work with Educational Testing Service (ETS), Princeton, New Jersey. The Commission authorized the Executive Director to enter into a contract with ETS during its March 8, 2001, meeting and a contract was signed with ETS in May 2001. The contract calls for seven deliverables between July 1, 2001 and March 2, 2003. The contract with ETS calls for the contractor to review and analyze the subject matter requirements for the other states regarding the preparation of multiple subject and single subject teachers. The contract also calls for a review of credential emphasis or equivalent programs in other states pursuant to AB 877 and includes the development of a database of out-of-state teacher credential requirements. AB 877 requires the Commission to contract for periodic reviews of the comparability of out-of-state requirements related to subject matter requirements and credential emphasis or equivalent programs commencing in 2001 with the reviews to be updated every three years. The database of out-of-state teacher credential requirements is being developed in preparation for the next review cycle commencing in 2004.

Policy Issue to be Considered

Should the Commission adopt the findings on comparability by for the multiple subject-subject matter requirements and single subject-subject matter requirements contained in this agenda item?

Fiscal Impact Statement

AB 877 (Scott, 2000) appropriated \$350,000 from the General Fund for the purpose of conducting comparability studies of out-of-state teacher credential requirements for the 2000-2001 fiscal year.

Recommendation

That the Commission adopt the findings of comparability of the multiple subject-subject matter and single subject-subject matter requirements and standards requirements for the various states identified in this item.

Update on the Comparability Studies of Subject Matter Requirements in Other States (AB 877 – Scott, 2000)

**Professional Services Division
December 27, 2001**

Overview

This agenda report provides the Commission with a progress report on the implementation of AB 877 (Scott, 2000) related to the comparability of subject matter requirements and standards and credential emphasis or equivalent programs of other states. In March, 2001 the Commission authorized the Executive Director to enter into a contract with Educational Testing Service (ETS) located in Princeton, New Jersey, to complete a series of studies of comparability. The contract with ETS calls for seven different deliverables due from the contractor starting July 1, 2001 and ending March 2, 2003, as described in Table 4.

The Commission sponsored AB 877 to study those areas that were lacking in comparability in the initial comparability studies conducted pursuant to AB 1620 (Scott, 1998), and to further streamline and facilitate the entry of qualified out-of-state teachers into the teaching profession in California. A Reciprocity Task Force was established to implement AB 1620. The actions of the Commission that were recommended by the Task Force can be found on page 20 of this agenda item. Building on the initial comparability studies of AB 1620, AB 877 requires the Commission to contract for periodic reviews of the comparability of out-of-state requirements related to subject matter preparation, and credential emphasis or equivalent programs, commencing in 2001. These reviews will be updated every three years, commencing in 2004.

Educational Testing Service (ETS) first used the specific subject matter requirements and test specifications that exist in the various states being reviewed for this second deliverable from ETS, which was received on September 1, 2001. The analysis for comparability enabled ETS staff to both quantify and qualify the specific data. The program standards were then analyzed for comparability. The specific data from the subject matter requirements enabled the staff to further complete a comparison standard by standard. Particular attention was given to the standards from other states that dealt with candidate assessment, required subjects of study and standards related to depth and breadth of content studies.

Methodology Used by Contractor

As was the case for the first deliverable received on July 1, 2001, the second deliverable September 1, 2001 and the third deliverable that was received from ETS on December 1, 2001, included an analysis of the comparability of the standards, subject matter requirements and the test specifications for the subject matter content required for multiple subject (elementary teacher) candidates and in selected cases, single subject (secondary candidates) in the selected states. ETS first analyzed each specific content area in the subject matter requirement of all the states for elementary candidates in other states. The content areas were: literature and language studies; mathematics; visual and performing arts; physical education; human development; history; geography; social studies; science including biology, geoscience, physical science with

experimentation and investigation; and humanities. ETS determined the content match for each content area listed above and for each sub-content area. As an example, the sub-content areas for mathematics are number sense and numeration, geometry, measurement, algebraic concepts, number theory, real number systems, probability, and statistics and mathematical reasoning. The single subject areas studied for this deliverable were foreign language, music, physical education, art, English, mathematics, biology, chemistry, geoscience, physics, and for one state, social studies.

Second, ETS compared the exam specifications that each state had established based on the subject matter requirements. A comparative analysis was completed on each state's exam specifications.

The third comparative study completed by ETS was a standard by standard comparison. Standards related to candidate assessment, content breadth and depth, and specific subjects of study. The target or criteria used to determine comparability was an 80% match in the standards, subject matter requirements and examination specifications. In the case that a state was close to 80% in one area e.g., subject matter requirements) and higher than 80% in another area (e.g., standards) then the state was determined to be comparable.

Next Steps

As indicated on in Table 4, ETS will submit comparability studies and an analysis of credential emphasis or equivalent programs for the other 49 states and Washington D.C. The major focus of the ETS work will be comparable programs in other states related to Middle School, Early Childhood, CLAD and BCLAD Emphasis Programs. The ETS deliverable for this work is March 31, 2002 and the results of their work should be submitted to the Commission in the May or June, 2002 Commission Agenda.

The tables on the following pages identify the states that have been found to be comparable. Table 1 lists all states previously recognized as having comparable multiple subject, subject matter requirements. Table 2 lists the findings of ETS for three states regarding multiple subject, subject matter requirements.

Table 1

**States Previously Determined to be Comparable
By the Commission Under AB 1620 (Scott, 1998)**

Alabama	Kentucky	Oklahoma
Arizona	Maryland	Oregon
Arkansas	Michigan	Pennsylvania
Colorado	Minnesota	Rhode Island
Connecticut	Missouri	South Carolina
Delaware	Montana	South Dakota
Florida	Nebraska	Tennessee
Georgia	Nevada	Texas
Idaho	New York	Utah
Illinois	North Dakota	Virginia
Indiana	Ohio	Wisconsin

Table 2

Findings on Multiple Subject-Subject Matter Comparability for Three Additional States

State	Percent Content Match	Percent Standards Match
Alaska	91	92
Hawaii	84	94
Massachusetts	89	85

Staff recommends that the Commission adopts the findings of ETS shown above, regarding multiple subject, subject matter comparability for three additional states.

Single Subject-Subject Matter Comparability Study

This agenda item also includes the results of recent comparability studies conducted by ETS regarding single subject, subject matter requirements for the forty nine (49) states and Washington D.C.

Table 3**New Findings on Single Subject-Subject Matter Comparability**

Foreign Language					
French – 1 State Previously Found Comparable			Spanish – 18 States Previously Found Comparable		
State	Percent Content Match	Percent Standards Match	State	Percent Content Match	Percent Standards Match
1. Alaska	88	95	1. Arizona	100	84
2. Louisiana	94	89	2. Hawaii	94	93
3. Michigan	88	86	3. Illinois	94	93
4. Minnesota	85	95	4. Indiana	88	96
5. Texas	100	95	5. Kansas	81	89
			6. Massachusetts	100	84
			7. Montana	88	96
			8. New Hampshire	88	93
			9. New Jersey	88	84
			10. Ohio	88	95
			11. Pennsylvania	88	86
			12. South Carolina	85	86
			13. South Dakota	85	91
			14. Vermont	84	79
			15. Wisconsin	88	95
			16. Louisiana	94	82
			17. Texas	100	95

Art – 17 States Previously Found Comparable		
State	Percent Content Match	Percent Standards Match
1. Colorado	82	90
2. Hawaii	82	90
3. Idaho	96	95
4. Illinois	96	97
5. Kansas	82	83
6. Louisiana	86	85
7. Massachusetts	100	98
8. Montana	89	95
9. New Hampshire	86	93
10. North Dakota	86	83
11. South Dakota	86	88
12. Wisconsin	86	87

English – 45 States Previously Found Comparable		
State	Percent Content Match	Percent Standards Match
1. Idaho	83	92
2. Iowa	83	85
3. New Hampshire	100	92
4. Utah	100	92

Mathematics – 37 States Previously Found Comparable		
States	Percent Content Match	Percent Standards Match
1. Idaho	100	99
2. Washington D.C.	100	80
3. Montana	97	98
4. Nevada	88	83
5. New Hampshire	97	98
6. New Mexico	100	85
7. North Dakota	97	98
8. Ohio	84	81
9. Utah	94	98
10. Vermont	84	86

Music – 21 States Previously Found Comparable		
State	Percent Content Match	Percent Standards Match
1. Florida	88	96
2. Hawaii	100	98
3. Illinois	100	98
4. Indiana	100	100
5. Iowa	88	96
6. Kansas	81	91
7. Louisiana	100	98
8. Michigan	94	88
9. Mississippi	100	98
10. Montana	100	98
11. Nebraska	81	91
12. New Hampshire	100	98
13. New Jersey	100	96
14. New York	100	81
15. North Dakota	100	98
16. South Carolina	100	100
17. Texas	94	96
18. West Virginia	100	88
19. Wisconsin	81	93
20. Wyoming	100	79

Physical Education – 34 States Previously Found Comparable		
State	Percent Content Match	Percent Standards Match
1. Washington D.C.	100	80
2. Kansas	79	84
3. Louisiana	100	98
4. Maine	100	86
5. Texas	100	100
6. New Mexico	100	85

Social Science – 40 States Previously Found Comparable		
State	Percent Content Match	Percent Standards Match
1. Washington D.C.	100	100
2. Idaho	79	88
3. Iowa	100	85
4. Nebraska	92	90
5. New Hampshire	100	90
6. North Dakota	100	87
7. Vermont	100	87
8. Wyoming	96	79

Biology – 28 States Previously Found Comparable		
State	Percent Content Match	Percent Standards Match
1. Arizona	90	89
2. Washington D.C.	100	79
3. Kansas	90	94
4. Massachusetts	100	89
5. Montana	80	97
6. Nevada	100	86
7. New Hampshire	100	98
8. New Jersey	100	95
9. North Dakota	100	98
10. Utah	95	95
11. Vermont	100	89
12. Wisconsin	100	94

Chemistry – 26 States Previously Found Comparable		
State	Percent Content Match	Percent Standards Match
1. Arizona	90	84
2. Idaho	100	95
3. Michigan	90	83
4. Montana	80	95
5. Nevada	100	89
6. New Hampshire	100	98
7. New Jersey	80	94
8. North Dakota	100	98
9. Pennsylvania	100	91
10. South Dakota	80	83
11. Texas	95	89
12. Utah	80	94
13. Vermont	80	88
14. Wisconsin	80	92

Geoscience – 25 States Previously Found Comparable		
State	Percent Content Match	Percent Standards Match
1. Alaska	100	97
2. Washington D.C.	100	79
3. Idaho	90	95
4. Kansas	100	94
5. Montana	80	95
6. New Hampshire	100	98
7. North Dakota	80	100
8. South Dakota	85	83
9. Utah	95	95
10. Vermont	100	89
11. Wisconsin	100	94

Physics – 30 States Previously Found Comparable		
State	Percent Content Match	Percent Standards Match
1. Arizona	100	86
2. Washington D.C.	100	79
3. Idaho	100	95
4. Kansas	80	92
5. Massachusetts	100	90
6. Michigan	96	82
7. Montana	80	95
8. New Hampshire	100	98
9. North Dakota	100	98
10. Oregon	88	94
11. South Dakota	95	84
12. Texas	96	88
13. Utah	80	94
14. Vermont	88	88
15. Wisconsin	80	92
16. Wyoming	83	83

Staff Recommends that the Commission approve the single subject-subject matter requirements of the states list above as being comparable to those established by the Commission for single subject-subject matter requirements for California single subject teachers.

Following is a table with information regarding the seven deliverables for the contract with ETS.

Table 4

ETS Contract Schedule

<i>Due Date</i>	<i>Deliverable</i>
1. July 1, 2001	Submit analysis of multiple subject – subject matter and standards comparability, including exam specifications for ten (10) selected states
2. September 1, 2001	Submit analysis of other state multiple subject – subject matter requirements, including exam specifications
3. December 1, 2001	Submit remaining multiple subject – subject matter studies and all remaining single subject – subject matter comparability studies Submit source documents for studies
4. March 31, 2002	Submit analysis documents of the credential emphasis or equivalent programs comparability study with half of the states
5. June 1, 2002	Submit report on the results of the credential emphasis or equivalent programs comparability study with all state data and source documents included
6. December 1, 2002	Submit CD electronic files, state documents and summary of survey results
7. March 2, 2003	Submit complete database
8. March 15, 2003	Contract completed

Previous Actions of the Commission

Regarding AB 1620 (Scott, 1998) and AB 877 (Scott, 2000) Comparability Studies

Following are a series of charts that show the comparability of various multiple, single and special education credential requirements. Candidates from out-of-state are presently being credentialed under these provisions.

**Summary of States Determined to be Comparable
If The Commission Takes Favorable Action 2-6 - 2002**

Multiple Subject-Subject Matter Requirements	36 States
Single Subject-Subject Matter Requirements	
English	49 States
Math	47 States
Social Science	48 States
Science	
Biological Science	40 States
Chemistry	40 States
Physics	46 States
Geoscience	36 States
Physical Education	40 States
Music	41 States
Art	29 States
Foreign Languages	
French	6 States
Spanish	35 States
Special Education	
Mild-Moderate	31 States
Moderate-Severe	22 States
Low Incidence	
Deaf and Hard-of-Hearing	28 States
Physical and Health Impairments	9 States
Visual Impairments	26 States
Early Childhood Special Education	18 States
Clinical Rehabilitation: Audiology	7 States
Clinical Rehab: Lang., Speech, Hearing	24 States
Clinical Rehab: Orientation and Mobility	1 State

Appendix A

Findings of Subject Matter Comparability for Out-of-State Elementary and Secondary Teacher Preparation Programs as of February 6, 2002

State	Multiple Subjects	Single Subject Art	Single Subject English	Single Subject French/ Spanish SP FR	Single Subject Math	Single Subject Music	Single Subject P.E.	Single Subject Science: Biological Science	Single Subject Science: Chemistry	Single Subject Science: Geoscience	Single Subject Science: Physics	Single Subject Social Science
Alabama	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X			X
Alaska	X*		X		X		X	X	X	X*	X	X
Arizona	X		X	X*	X			X*	X*		X*	X
Arkansas	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Colorado	X	X*	X	X	X	X	X			X	X	X
Connecticut	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Delaware	X		X		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
D.C.			X	X	X*	X	X*	X*		X*	X*	X*
Florida	X	X	X	X	X	X*	X					X
Georgia	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Hawaii	X*	X*	X	X*	X	X*	X	X	X	X	X	X
Idaho	X	X*	X*		X*				X*	X*	X*	X*
Illinois	X	X*	X	X*	X	X*	X	X	X	X	X	X
Indiana	X	X	X	X*	X	X*	X	X	X	X	X	X
Iowa			X*			X*						X*
Kansas		X*	X	X*	X	X*	X*	X*		X*	X*	X
Kentucky	X		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Louisiana		X*	X	X*	X	X*	X*	X			X	X
Maine			X		X		X*					X
Maryland	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Massachusetts	X*	X*	X	X*	X	X	X	X*	X	X	X*	X
Michigan	X	X	X		X	X*	X		X*		X*	
Minnesota	X	X	X	X*	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X

- - Pending Commission approval at its February 2002 meeting

Appendix A

State	Multiple Subjects	Single Subject Art	Single Subject English	Single Subject Spanish /French SP FR	Single Subject Math	Single Subject Music	Single Subject P.E.	Single Subject Science: Biological Science	Single Subject Science: Chemistry	Single Subject Science: Geoscience	Single Subject Science: Physics	Single Subject Social Science
Mississippi			X		X	X*	X	X	X		X	X
Missouri	X		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Montana	X	X*	X	X*	X*	X*		X*	X*	X*	X*	
Nebraska	X		X		X	X*						X*
Nevada	X		X	X	X*	X	X	X*	X*		X	X
New Hampshire		X*	X*	X*	X*	X*		X*	X*	X*	X*	X*
New Jersey			X	X*	X	X*	X	X*	X*	X	X	X
New Mexico			X		X*	X*	X*				X	X
New York	X		X	X	X	X*	X	X	X	X	X	X
N. Carolina		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
N. Dakota	X	X*	X		X*	X*		X*	X*	X*	X*	X*
Ohio	X	X	X	X*	X*	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Oklahoma	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Oregon	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X*	X
Penn.	X	X	X	X*	X	X	X		X*	X	X	X
Rhode Is.	X		X		X		X	X	X	X	X	X
S. Carolina	X		X	X*	X	X*	X	X	X		X	X
S. Dakota	X	X*	X	X*	X	X	X		X*	X*	X*	X
Tennessee	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Texas	X	X	X	X*	X	X*	X*	X	X*	X	X*	X
Utah	X		X*		X*		X	X*	X*	X*	X*	X
Vermont				X*	X*			X*	X*	X*	X*	X*
Virginia	X		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Washington			X			X		X	X	X	X	X
West Virginia		X	X		X	X*	X	X	X		X	X
Wisconsin	X	X*	X	X*	X	X*	X	X*	X*	X*	X*	X
Wyoming			X			X*					X*	X*

* - Pending Commission approval at its February 2002 meeting